

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JANUARY 24, 2008

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: M. MARGO WHEELER

☐ Consent ☒ Discussion

SUBJECT:

VAR-25959 - VARIANCE - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT: T-MOBILE USA, INC. - OWNER: VILLAGE CENTER, INC. - Request for a Variance TO ALLOW A RESIDENTIAL ADJACENCY SETBACK OF 138 FEET WHERE 240 FEET IS REQUIRED FOR A PROPOSED WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITY, STEALTH DESIGN on 7.64 acres at 910 North Rancho Drive (APN 139-29-201-004), C-2 (General Commercial) Zone, Ward 5 (Barlow)

P.C.: FINAL ACTION (Unless Appealed Within 10 Days)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

2

City Council Meeting

0

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

2

City Council Meeting

0

RECOMMENDATION:

DENIAL

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location and Aerial Maps
2. Conditions and Staff Report
3. Supporting Documentation
4. Photos
5. Justification Letter
6. Protest/Support Postcards
7. Submitted after final agenda – Protest Postcard for Items 49 and 50

Motion made by GLENN TROWBRIDGE to Deny

Passed For: 7; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 0

SAM DUNNAM, DAVID STEINMAN, RICHARD TRUESDELL, BYRON GOYNES, GLENN TROWBRIDGE, STEVEN EVANS, VICKI QUINN; (Against-None); (Abstain-None); (Did Not Vote-None); (Excused-None)

Minutes:

CHAIRMAN GOYNES declared the Public Hearing open for Items 49 and 50.

DOUG RANKIN, Planning and Development Department, stated the variance request is a self-imposed hardship and recommended denial of both applications.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JANUARY 24, 2008

DAMIAN HUGGARD, 7351 West Charleston Boulevard, appeared on behalf of the applicant and briefly described the stealth design of the tower and its proposed location. He explained the location had been determined after working with the property owner to place the tower where it would have the least impact on traffic to the site. MR. HUGGARD also pointed out the walls, powers lines and streets which would buffer the adjacent homes.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, suggested that the cell antennas be placed on tall public facilities which would provide revenue for the City.

DONNA LaFAVE, Rancho Vista Realty, appeared on behalf of a customer. She stated the setback requirements should be followed and requested the tower be placed further away from the neighboring homes.

MR. HUGGARD informed CHAIRMAN GOYNES that the location of the cell towers are determined by gaps in existing network coverage.

COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL disagreed with the applicant's contention that because of the high demand for services, the only option is to place the towers adjacent to the residential homes. COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL noted that there were several options to consider and felt that the applicant was more concerned with meeting the needs of the landowner rather than the needs of the City and its residents. MR. HUGGARD stressed that the industry worked very hard to meet the Code and explained that the greatest demand for cell service was coming from residential users as they moved away from land-based phone service.

CHAIRMAN GOYNES suggested that cell towers be placed in the City's parks.

MR. HUGGARD informed COMMISSIONER STEINMAN that the applicant had considered mounting the antenna on a light pole, but it was not feasible as the ground equipment would have reduced the shopping center's parking. He also stated that the industry was working with the City to establish creative solutions for the aesthetics and placement of cell phone towers.

COMMISSIONER QUINN suggested the cell phone industry to partner with the Clark County School District and place cell towers on school sites. She noted such a partnership would be beneficial to both parties. MR. HUGGARD expressed the applicant's willingness to work with the District, but explained the District's mechanism for addressing telecommunications included some non-negotiable restrictions which made it very difficult for the industry to place cell towers on school property.

CHAIRMAN GOYNES declared the Public Hearing closed for Items 49 and 50.